

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the arguments presented below.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,377,681 of Bremmer ("Bremmer").

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bremmer in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0074115 of George ("George").

Claims 1-23 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of co-pending application No. 10/750,414.

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1, 10, and 22 were amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims do not add new matter. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 5-6 and in claims 2-3 as originally filed. Examples are found throughout the specification.

Response to Provisional Double-Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-23 were provisionally rejected for double-patenting over claims 1-28 of co-pending application no. 10/750,414.

Applicant respectfully brings to the Examiner's attention that claims 1, 11, and 24 of another co-pending application 10/750,559 were provisionally rejected over claim 19 of the present application.

Applicant submits that a resolution will need to be reached with respect to double-patenting rejections among 10/750,415 (the present application),

10/750,414, and 10/750,559 with respect to these provisional rejections. A terminal disclaimer in the present case is not warranted at this time.

Given that none of the aforementioned applications has been allowed, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the provisional non-statutory double-patenting rejection until such a time as one of the aforementioned co-pending applications issues or is at least allowed. If no terminal disclaimer has been filed in either of the aforementioned applications at that time and the Examiner believes a terminal disclaimer is still necessary, applicant can file the appropriate terminal disclaimers once at least one of the aforementioned applications has been allowed.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-23 were rejected as being anticipated by Bremmer. Applicant submits none of claims 1-23 is anticipated by Bremmer. In particular, Bremmer does not teach or disclose: *successively controlling the power to transition to one or more supply levels intermediate between the first and second supply levels if the second supply level, operational state of the electronic device, or difference between the first and second supply levels satisfies one or more pre-determined conditions.*

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Bremmer as set forth in the Office Action. The only transition control exhibited by Bremmer appears to be selecting one of a plurality of power supplies.

In contrast, claims 1, 10, and 22 include the language:

1. A method comprising:

controlling a variable power supply to supply power at approximately a first supply level for an electronic device;

identifying a second supply level to be supplied for the electronic device; and

in response to identifying the second supply level, controlling the variable power supply to control a transition of the power from approximately the first supply level toward the second supply level prior to controlling the variable power supply to supply power at approximately the second supply level for the electronic device, *wherein the power is successively controlled to transition to one or more supply levels*

intermediate between the first and second supply levels if the second supply level, operational state of the electronic device, or difference between the first and second supply levels satisfies one or more pre-determined conditions.

(Claim 1, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

10. An electronic device comprising:

a supply level controller coupled to control a variable power supply to supply power at a supply level for the electronic device; and

a transition-to-target controller coupled to control the supply level controller to control the variable power supply to supply power at approximately a first supply level for the electronic device and to control the variable power supply to control a transition of the power from approximately the first supply level toward a second supply level prior to controlling the variable power supply to supply power at approximately the second supply level for the electronic device, *wherein the power is successively controlled to transition to one or more supply levels intermediate between the first and second supply levels if the second supply level, operational state of the electronic device, or difference between the first and second supply levels satisfies one or more pre-determined conditions.*

(Claim 10, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

22. An apparatus comprising:

means for controlling a variable power supply to supply power at approximately a first supply level for an electronic device; and

means for controlling the variable power supply to control a transition of the power from approximately the first supply level toward a second supply level prior to controlling the variable power supply to supply power at approximately the second supply level for the electronic device, *wherein the power is successively controlled to transition to one or more supply levels intermediate between the first and second supply levels if the second supply level, operational state of the electronic device, or difference between the first and second supply levels satisfies one or more pre-determined conditions.*

(Claim 22, as amended)(*emphasis added*)

Thus applicant submits claims 1, 10, and 22 are not anticipated by Bremmer. Given that claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, claims 11-21 depend from claim 10, and claim 23 depends from claim 22, applicant submits claims 2-9, 11-21, and 23 are likewise not anticipated by the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections have been overcome.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bremmer and George. Applicant submits that George does not make up for the deficiencies of Bremmer and that claims 9 and 20 are dependent claims which depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. Thus claims 9 and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections have been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and arguments presented above, applicant respectfully submits the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. Accordingly, claims 1-23 should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (512) 858-9910.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 15, 2006

William D. Davis
William D. Davis
Reg. No. 38,428

DAVIS & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 1093
Dripping Springs, TX 78620